UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,132	03/29/2006	Sang-Won Jeong	CU-4661 WWP	9058

26530 7590 04/02/2008

LADAS & PARRY LLP
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER	
COLUCCI, MICHAEL C	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2626	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
04/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/565,132	JEONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL C. COLUCCI	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 January 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☒ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *04/07/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rust et al. USPGPUB 20030221171 A1 (hereinafter Rust) in view of Tokieda et al. USPGPUB 20020152063 A1 (hereinafter Tokieda).

Re claims 1 and 7, Rust teaches a local system of a multilingual rights data dictionary (RDD) ([0109]), for connecting to a central system having a multilingual RDD registry ([0114] – [0115] & Tables V, VI), the local system comprising:

a local RDD registry for storing an RDD ([0114] – [0115] & Tables V, VI) of a specific language ([0066]);

a processing means for parsing a rights term ([0038] & Fig. 10) and interpreting the rights term by referring to the local RDD registry ([0004]),

wherein the processing means acquires rights term interpreting information ([0004]) based on the multilingual RDD registry ([0114] – [0115] & Tables V, VI)

However, Rust fails to teach connecting to the central system when the rights term interpreting information does not exist (Tokieda [0007] – [0008] & Fig. 5) in the local RDD registry ([0153] & Fig. 5)

Tokieda teaches the multilingual processing database is provided with a plurality of servers, which can be distributively disposed. The database acquires an actual server name, server position, multilingual processing database name and the like from database management data in response to a request for a language ID, page ID and the like, and accesses a multilingual processing database desired out of database servers. Additionally, Tokieda teaches a master web site containing language data for multilingual translation as well as external multilingual processing databases containing several languages Japanese, German, English, French, etc., that can be referenced when non-language (image) or language is not handled through the master website.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention a multilingual rights data dictionary that connects to a central system when local references do not exist. Outsourcing a database (such as through the internet) allows for increased language databases, where the local language data does not need to contain all language for translation. Having external databases provides a faster method of translation, where the original RDD data can create genealogies, context description, and logical relationships based on a foreign language.

Re claims 2, 5, 8, and 11, Rust teaches the local system as recited in claim 1, wherein the multilingual RDD registry includes:

a set of local RDDs of a specific language ([0114] – [0115] & Tables V, VI) stored wherein the rights term interpreting information is extracted ([0004])

a link for connecting the local RDDs logically ([0101]),

However, Rust fails to teach based on the link a plurality of local systems (Tokieda [0153] & Fig. 5)

Tokieda teaches the multilingual processing database is provided with a plurality of servers, which can be distributively disposed. The database acquires an actual server name, server position, multilingual processing database name and the like from database management data in response to a request for a language ID, page ID and the like, and accesses a multilingual processing database desired out of database servers. Additionally, Tokieda teaches a master web site containing language data for multilingual translation as well as external multilingual processing databases containing several languages Japanese, German, English, French, etc., that can be referenced when non-language (image) or language is not handled through the master website.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention a multilingual rights data dictionary that connects to a central system when local references do not exist. Outsourcing a database (such as through the internet) allows for increased language databases, where the local language data does not need to contain all language for translation. Having external databases provides a faster method of translation, where the original RDD data can create genealogies, context description, and logical relationships based on a foreign language.

Re claims 3 and 9, Rust teaches the local system as recited in claim I, wherein the processing means acquires the rights term interpreting information ([0004]) from the local RDD registry ([0114] – [0115] & Tables V, VI)

However, Rust fails to teach another local system linked to the multilingual RDD registry (Tokieda [0153] & Fig. 5)

Tokieda teaches the multilingual processing database is provided with a plurality of servers, which can be distributively disposed. The database acquires an actual server name, server position, multilingual processing database name and the like from database management data in response to a request for a language ID, page ID and the like, and accesses a multilingual processing database desired out of database servers. Additionally, Tokieda teaches a master web site containing language data for multilingual translation as well as external multilingual processing databases containing several languages Japanese, German, English, French, etc., that can be referenced when non-language (image) or language is not handled through the master website.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention a multilingual rights data dictionary that connects to a central system when local references do not exist. Outsourcing a database (such as through the internet) allows for increased language databases, where the local language data does not need to contain all language for translation. Having external databases provides a faster method of translation, where the original RDD data can create genealogies, context description, and logical relationships based on a foreign language.

Re claims 4 and 10, Rust teaches a central system of a multilingual rights data dictionary (RDD) ([0109]), the central system comprising:

a multilingual RDD registry ([0114] – [0115] & Tables V, VI);

a processing means for receiving a rights term from the connected local system, extracting interpreting information of the rights term ([0004]) based on the multilingual RDD registry and transmitting the interpreting information ([0114] – [0115] & Tables V, VI)

However, Rust fails to teach for connecting to a plurality of local systems (Tokieda [0153] & Fig. 5)

Tokieda teaches the multilingual processing database is provided with a plurality of servers, which can be distributively disposed. The database acquires an actual server name, server position, multilingual processing database name and the like from database management data in response to a request for a language ID, page ID and the like, and accesses a multilingual processing database desired out of database servers. Additionally, Tokieda teaches a master web site containing language data for multilingual translation as well as external multilingual processing databases containing several languages Japanese, German, English, French, etc., that can be referenced when non-language (image) or language is not handled through the master website.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention a multilingual rights data dictionary that connects to a central system when local references do not exist. Outsourcing a database (such as through the internet) allows for increased language databases, where the local language data does not need to contain all language for translation. Having external databases provides a faster method of translation, where the original RDD data can create genealogies, context description, and logical relationships based on a foreign language.

Re claim 6, central system of a multilingual rights data dictionary (RDD) ([0109]), the central system comprising:

a multilingual RDD registry for including link information ([0114] – [0115] & Tables V, VI) which logically connects local RDD registries maintained by the local systems ([0101]);

a processing means for receiving a rights term from the connected local system and transmitting information which is needed to interpret the rights ([0004]) term based on the multilingual RDD registry to the local system ([0114] – [0115] & Tables V, VI)

for connecting to a plurality of local systems (Tokieda [0153] & Fig. 5)

Tokieda teaches the multilingual processing database is provided with a plurality of servers, which can be distributively disposed. The database acquires an actual server name, server position, multilingual processing database name and the like from database management data in response to a request for a language ID, page ID and the like, and accesses a multilingual processing database desired out of database servers. Additionally, Tokieda teaches a master web site containing language data for multilingual translation as well as external multilingual processing databases containing several languages Japanese, German, English, French, etc., that can be referenced when non-language (image) or language is not handled through the master website.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention a multilingual rights data dictionary that connects to a central system when local references do not exist. Outsourcing a database (such as through

the internet) allows for increased language databases, where the local language data does not need to contain all language for translation. Having external databases provides a faster method of translation, where the original RDD data can create genealogies, context description, and logical relationships based on a foreign language.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 20050271205 A1, US 20070087756 A1, US 20070192399 A1, US 20070242829 A1, US 20040139023 A1, US 20050066317 A1, US 20050021754 A1, US 20050075998 A1, US 7124364 B2, US 20030023424 A1, US 20040034521 A1, US 7130792 B2, US 7139696 B2, US 6334101 B1, US 7016977 B1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Colucci whose telephone number is (571)-270-1847. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm, Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Colucci Jr.
Patent Examiner
AU 2626
(571)-270-1847
Michael.Colucci@uspto.gov

/Richemond Dorvil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626